



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/323,415	06/01/1999	LARRY T. HARADA	06975/041001	9156

7590 08/12/2002

W. Karl Renner
FISH & RICHARDSON PC
601 THIRTEENTH STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NOBAHAR, ABDULHAKIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/323,415

Applicant(s)

HARADA ET AL.

Examiner

Abdulahakim Nobahar

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 4, line 1 “target server” is referenced, but “proxy server” seems appropriate.

Appropriate correction is required.
2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 9, line 18, “503” is referenced incorrectly, “502” is suggested

Appropriate correction is required.
3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 12, lines 10 and 11, “304-205” is incorrect, “304-305” is suggested.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities: “target server” in paragraph 4, lines 5 and 6 is referenced incorrectly, and “proxy server” is suggested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 22, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (5,673,322) (hereinafter Pepe) in view of Gabber et al. (XP-002059819) (hereinafter Gabber).
7. As per claims 1, 11, and 22, Pepe (Figure 5) discloses a client using a web browser 54 to send a request to a web sever 68 via a local proxy sever 56. The proxy server 56 converts it from an application layer protocol based message to a transport layer protocol based message (column 5, lines 54 through 56), then transmits the request to a remote proxy server (column 11, line 55), located at the target web server place (column 5, lines 50 through 52). Also, Pepe (column 14, lines 25 through 35) discloses the conversion process includes encrypting the client request, and further indicates (column 9, lines 13 through 40) that for this purpose, one of ordinary skill in the art could easily design an encryption scheme based on well-known principles. Pepe, however, does not specifically disclose the augmentation of the user request with encrypted user profile information and its transmission directly to the web server. Gabber teaches the implementation of a cryptographic function and transmission of the user request directly to a targeted web server by a proxy server named Janus (page 20, lines 4 through 7 and page 21, lines 12 through 13). Gabber also teaches appending the user request with new information related to the user before sending it to the web server (page 21, line 23 and page 24, lines 1 through 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to append a user request with new information related to the user before sending it to

the web server as taught in Gabber in the communication system of Pepe because it would provide for the secure and direct access of the user to the targeted web site. This arrangement especially is advantageous for the web sites that do not have external proxy sever.

8. As per claim 4, 12 and 28, Pepe does not disclose the retrieval of user profile information from a database. Gabber teaches the use of user information by the proxy server to be sent along with the user request to the web server. This is indicative of retrieving the user information from a kind of storage, i.e. a database containing user information (page 21, paragraph 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Pepe with Gabber because it would provide for the proxy server to carry out only the process of authentication of the user on the subsequent visits of the user to the web site.
9. Claims 2, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (5,673,322) (hereinafter Pepe) in view of Gabber et al. (XP-002059819) (hereinafter Gabber) and further in view of White (6,049,877).
10. Pepe in view of Gabber teaches all the limitations of the above claims but does not specify the creation of a token in reference to the user information by the web server to be transmitted to the client proxy server. White, however, teaches that the web server creates a token with regard to the user information. The token is sent to and being stored at the client

Art Unit: 2132

proxy server for use with subsequent user requests (column 10, lines 1 through 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a token for subsequent user request as taught in White, in the system of Pepe in view of Gabber because it would allow a proxy sever not to encrypt and transmit the user information profile in the subsequent queries to the web server by the user.

11. Claims 6-10, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (5,673,322) (hereinafter Pepe) in view of Gabber et al. (XP-002059819) (hereinafter Gabber) and further in view of Lincke et al. (6,253,326 B1) (herinafter Lincke.)
12. Pepe discloses the use of an encryption scheme for encrypting the user request (column 14, line 31). Pepe in view of Gabber does not specify the method of the encryption. Lincke teaches the generation and the use of a local key as an encryption key to encrypt the user message and the use of a public key to encrypt the local key (column 115, lines 45 through 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a local key as encryption key as taught in Lincke for the encryption system of Pepe in view of Gabber because it would provide for the proxy sever to securely transmit the encryption key to a remote web server site.
13. Claims 13-15, 18, 25, 27, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (5,673,322) (hereinafter Pepe) in view of Petitcolas (XP-00214286).

14. As per claim 13-15, 18, 25, 27, 31, and 32, Pepe discloses creation of a response to user request at the targeted web site server and transmitting it to the client proxy server (column 16, lines 1 through 12). Pepe, however, does not specify the extraction of user information from the request in order to generate a response. Petitcolas teaches the extraction of user information from the receiving message and using this information to generate a response and transmitting it back to the client proxy (page 302, section 4.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extract the user information from the user request at the information server as taught in Petitcolas in the system of Pepe, because it would allow the information server to generate a response for the user and transmit it to the client proxy server without further re-transmission of user information back and forth between the client site and the web site, thus reducing the magnitude of the encryption process and the transmitting messages between the two sites.
15. Claims 16,17, 19-21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (5,673,322) (hereinafter Pepe) in view of Petitcolas (XP-00214286) and further in view of White (6,049,877).
16. As per claim 16, 17, 19-21, and 26, Pepe in view of Petitcolas discloses all the limitations of these claims but does not specify associating a reference token with the user information and including it in the response. White, however, teaches associating a token with the user information and transmitting the token with response to the client proxy server (column 10, lines 1 through 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to create a token at the information server to be sent to the client proxy for use with subsequent user request as taught in White, in the system of Pepe in view of Petitcolas, because it would allow the information server to generate a token in association with the user, and transmit to the client proxy server only the token along with the response for use with the subsequent requests. This combination eliminates the transmission of user information back to the client site, thus reducing the magnitude of the encryption process and the transmitting message to the client proxy.

17. Claims 23, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (5,673,322) (hereinafter Pepe) in view of Gabber and further in view of White (6,049,877).
18. As per claim 23 and 29, Pepe in view of Gabber discloses all the limitations of these claims, but does not specify the generation of a reference token at the web server for use with the subsequent user requests. White, however, teaches the use of a token with the subsequent user requests to be transmitted to the web server (column 10, lines 1 through 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a token in reference to the user at the information server as taught in White in the system of Pepe in view of Gabber, because it would allow the proxy server to transmit only the reference token along with the subsequent user requests to the information server. This combination eliminates the re-transmission of user information from the user site to the web

site, thus reducing the magnitude of the transmitting messages to the web site by the proxy server.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,810 to Shapiro et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,586,260 to Hu

U.S. Pat. No. 6,373,950 B1 to Rowney

U.S. Pat. No. 6,421,781 to Fox et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,081,900 to Subramaniam et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 200/0047484 A1 to Medvinsky et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,961,593 to Gabber et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,308,216 to Goldszmidt et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,212,640 B1 to Abdelnur et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,145 to Bainbridge et al.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdulhakim Nobahar whose telephone number is 703-305-.... The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 703-305-1830. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2132

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4832.

A.N.

Abdulahkim Nobahar
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

an
July 30, 2002

Gilberto Barron
GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100